Received: 18 December 2016 | Revised: 22 March 2017 | Accepted: 31 March 2017

DOI: 10.1111/hic3.12391

WILEY

ARTICLE

"Towards a connected history of bondage in the Mediterranean: Recent trends in the field"

Daniel Hershenzon 

University of Connecticut

Correspondence
Department of Literatures, Cultures & Languages Oak Hall East SSHB Room 207 365 Fairfield Way U-1057 University of Connecticut Storrs, CT 06269
Email: daniel.hershenzon@uconn.edu

Abstract

This review article examines recent scholarship on Christian captives in the early modern western Mediterranean. It points out how piracy, captivity, and ransom linked the lives of Christian and Muslim captives, and by extension connected Spain, France and the Italian Peninsula with Morocco and Ottoman Algiers and Tunis. It focuses on slavery, captivity, and redemption, namely, on issues of labor, on the importance of writing as a tool to facilitate ransom, and on the rescue mechanisms that enabled the ransom and return home of captives.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Over the last 20 years, scholarship has increasingly recognized the historical importance of bondage in the early modern Mediterranean. Between 1450 and 1700, the number of Christians and Muslims taken captive and enslaved across the Mediterranean was equal, perhaps greater than that of sub-Saharan Africans enslaved in the Atlantic world (Bono, 2002, 2010; Borucki, Eltis, & Wheat, 2015; Davis, 2001; Fontenay, 2001; Lovejoy, 1982; Sarti, 2001; Stella, 2000). While studies of this topic have proliferated, they remain sharply divided into two fields: slavery of Muslims and sub-Saharan Africans in Europe, on the one hand, and captivity of Christians in Morocco and in the Ottoman Empire, on the other. The former field has produced much more research, usually focused on cities or local areas and patterns (Phillips, 2014). The latter emphasizes themes of interconnection, circulation, and encounter, but is often bound by a confessional or national framework. The decision to privilege these analytic perspectives results in writing the histories of Spanish, French, English, or Algerian captivity rather than a connected history of Mediterranean bondage.

Research limited to either Christian or Muslim bondage obscures the connections that the ransoming of captives created across the sea. The procedure was geared to separate Christians from Muslims, but it had the unintended consequences of creating a Mediterranean system of bondage and new links between Christian and Muslim states. Piracy and captivity were disruptive practices. This statement may sound banal. Obviously, captivity disrupted the lives of the individuals who lost their freedom. But captivity generated an ethno-religious disorder that also disrupted the political order. Captivity transplanted Christians to Muslim territory and threatened their confessional identity while forging Muslim slave communities in Europe. For the early modern Spanish monarchy, captivity was particularly troubling as it challenged the project of imposing ethno-religious unity on Spanish territory (Portugal, Naples, Sicily,

For their helpful suggestions on earlier versions of this article, I would like to thank Anya Zilberstein, Daniel Stolzenberg, Danna Agmon, Molly Warsh, and the two anonymous readers of History Compass.

Milan, and Sardinia formed part of the Spanish Empire) and among Spanish subjects. Typically, Catholic states sought to undo this mixing and were committed to redeeming their subjects from the Maghrib. Ransoming of captives allowed rulers to undo the mess captivity created and reinsert and re-socialize subjects in their home communities. In the process, however, Christian powers (including ones that formed diplomatic relations with Morocco, Algiers, or Tunis) forged new ties with Muslims and Jews, the circulation of goods and information between the Maghrib and Europe intensified, and the lives of Christian and Muslim captives became interrelated and interdependent.

Studying Christian and Muslim captivity in isolation renders their histories incomplete, if not largely incomprehensible. This review article examines recent scholarship on Christian captives in the early modern western Mediterranean from the perspective of connected history (Subrahmanyam, 1997).[1] It focuses on slavery, captivity, and redemption, especially on issues of labor, on the importance of writing as a tool to facilitate ransom, and on the rescue mechanisms that enabled the ransom and return home of captives.

2 | SLAVERY

Scholars have spilled much ink about the nature of Mediterranean bondage and whether its victims were captives or slaves. In the most widely read book on the topic, Robert Davis has argued that Muslim slave owners bought Christian captives in order to exploit their labor, that the majority lived and died as slaves, and thus that they should be studied as such (Davis, 2003).[2] In response, Michel Fontenay has insisted on the distinction between "slaves" defined by use value and "captives" by exchange value. He has argued that in the Mediterranean, as opposed to the Atlantic world, investors purchased captives for the sake of profit their future ransom could yield (Fontenay, 2008). These seemingly opposed positions share two premises: first, that slavery and captivity were modalities of bondage exclusive of one another; second, that these were the only existing modalities—piracy's victims either labored as slaves or were a shrewd market investment.

Early modern sources, however, use the terms "captives" and "slaves" interchangeably when referring to Christians in the Maghrib. The sources complicate the neat opposition scholars have suggested in other ways as well. For example, Spanish archives abound with petitions submitted by captives' kin in which they asked the crown for one of its galley slaves so that they could redeem their enslaved relatives in exchange. These petitions reflect how Christian and Muslim men (and more occasionally women) negotiated with one another the exchange of their husbands, sons, or brothers. These cases show that individuals often purchased slaves neither for their labor nor to profit from their ransom, but rather in order to use them to free enslaved family members (Fiume, 2015; Hershenzon, 2014). European kings were reluctant to give up on their galley slaves (Weiss, 2014). When approving such exchanges, the king nearly always demanded a substitute slave. While petitioners described the slaves they requested as old, sick, and weak, the king demanded young, healthy, and strong slaves in their place. The royal insistence on substitution further complicates the distinction between captives and slaves. Even when slaves faced a potential ransom and thus were about to become captives, the king's demand suggested that they maintained their use value. In these transactions, slaves changed hands, but the parties involved were not economic actors and the exchange did not take place in the market. Petitioners were seeking to reunite with their kin, and the king to fulfill his obligation to care for his subjects while assuring that his fleet had enough oarsmen to properly operate. Slavery and captivity, then, were not mutually exclusive dimensions or aspects of the lives of bonded individuals. It is possible to distinguish between captives and slaves only retrospectively and in relation to those who were ransomed and returned home (Bono, 2010).

Beyond this conceptual problem, scholars have focused much attention on the working conditions of slaves, arguing they were divided into different classes based on the tasks they had to carry out—pulling a galley oar, cultivating fields or laboring in mines, or working as servants; their owners—rulers, polities, or individuals; and their prospects of ransom (Barrio Gozalo, 2006; Davis, 2003; Friedman, 1983; Martínez Torres, 2004; Pike, 1983). On the basis of Trinitarian and Mercedarian sources and comments in Cervantes's "The Captive's Tale," scholars have implied that there was no mobility between these classes, and thus that, prospects of regaining liberty were

determined at the moment of capture and insertion into one of these groups (Cervantes, 2003). Captives belonging to the rulers were likely to be ransomed, others owned by individuals had good chances of returning home, but captives of the state were most likely to die as slaves.

Other sources—inquisition trials, captives' letters and narratives, and notarial records—portray a more flexible and dynamic system. Ownership and employment could and did change daily or seasonally. Owners might lease slaves by the day, and many slaves rowed during the summer and worked in the shipyards during the winter. In other words, slaves moved between public and private hands, and public ownership, while affecting the chances of regaining freedom, did not fully determine them. Some slaves were ransomed after pulling a galley oar for years (Pasamonte, 2006 [1605]; Galán, 2001 [1630's]). In this sense, the image that Mercedarian and Trinitarian friars depicted of a strict division into classes, owners, and type of bondage—captive to be ransomed or permanent slave—reflects the friars' position in the Maghribi political world rather than the reality slaves faced. The orders' rescue missions depended upon collaboration with local rulers, who imposed their ransom agenda on the friars. These rulers used their power to force the friars to spend their funds first on captives these rulers owned and then on captives these rulers' clients owned. Friars were rarely able to redeem "public" slaves. Thus, from the friars' perspective, the tripartite division seemed extremely fixed. In reality, the system was more flexible, and some public slaves found a way out of slavery.

The system's dynamism points to a host of unexplored questions. While we have a good sense of how Christian captives were sold for the first time (and how Muslim slaves in Spain changed hands several times), we know very little about how many times and under what circumstances Christians were resold. Inquisitorial and narrative sources indicate that most slaves changed hands several times (Bennassar, 1989). Only the first sale took a spectacular form at the slave market, a scene that opens many captivity narratives. Later exchanges took part in private and semiprivate spaces and were not limited to sales. Slaves were given as a payment for debts or as gifts, bequeathed, or bartered. Leasing, which might be for long or short periods of time, also represented a type of exchange. These exchanges affected slaves' social and occupational possibilities. Reconstructing these trajectories of displacement, social death, and rebirth is important for two reasons (Kopytoff, 1986). First, it suggests that slavery in North Africa was economically, but also socially and politically, much more important than previously assumed. Second, it sheds light on the experience of slaves in the Mediterranean and shows how their bondage differed from slavery in the Atlantic world or sub-Saharan Africa.

A few studies have taken a comparative approach to Mediterranean slavery. The earliest among these were *Annales* scholars writing in the 1950s and 1960s and comparing the prices of Christian and Muslim slaves (Mathiex, 1954) and of Christian and sub-Saharan slaves in the Maghrib (Valensi, 1967). More recently, scholars have explored galley slavery, the form of slavery that came to epitomize Mediterranean bondage. They have analyzed the proportions of slaves, convicts, and free oarsmen, as well as mortality rates, and have charted the rise and fall of the galley in different Mediterranean fleets (Fontenay, 1996; Stella, 2006; Zysberg, 1987). Others, more ambitiously, have compared various aspects of the captivity and enslavement of Muslims and Christians (Barrio Gozalo, 2006; Larquié, 1996; Vincent, 2008). They have shown that, in contrast to sub-Saharan slaves whose sale was fully institutionalized, the acquisition of Muslims and Christian slaves depended on naval and military encounters (Casares, 2000). Moreover, both Christians and Muslims could communicate with their homeland and might obtain their liberty, which sub-Saharan slaves who were shipped to Spain could not.

Addressing this last point from the perspective of connected history facilitates comparisons and brings into relief the unique features of bondage in the Mediterranean. The point of departure in this context is the relatively small size of the Mediterranean, which permitted Christians and Muslims to contact their relatives across the sea. Slaves could use geographic proximity to protect their interests. For example, in April 1663, fearing that Muslim slaves were interacting with corsairs who often attacked Alicante (a coastal city about 80 miles south of Valencia), the king ordered slave owners in the city to sell their slaves to others living further within the peninsular interior. The slaves, all of whom were rented out on a daily basis, feared that their new masters would employ them directly. Rented slaves were permitted to keep a portion of their daily earning, allowing them to save towards their ransom. Direct employment would deprive them of their meager income. The slaves submitted a complaint reminding royal officials

that Christians enslaved in the Maghrib were also entitled to keep a portion of their earning, implying a threat—if they were to be deprived of this privilege, their Christian counterparts in the Maghrib might also lose it (Hershenzon, 2018, forthcoming). Two decades earlier, in 1644, a manumitted Muslim slave arrested on his way to the Maghrib and enslaved again on the royal galleys despite carrying his freedom papers, also submitted a petition to the monarch. Like the slaves in Alicante, he reminded the crown that Christian captives were ransomed in greater numbers than Muslims, and should news about his unjust arrest reach the Maghrib, Christian captives there would pay for it. These were not the only requests and threats based on the reciprocal nature of Mediterranean bondage and predicated on the smallness of the sea and the short distances between Spain, Morocco, and Algiers or Italy and Tunis (Hershenzon, 2013). The proximity that made the sea a connected and connecting space, allowing slaves to activate personal and political ties back home from their place of enslavement, was a unique feature of the Mediterranean system of bondage, a privilege that sub-Saharans enslaved in the Mediterranean did not enjoy.

3 | CAPTIVITY

To early modern Mediterranean city dwellers captivity stories sounded painfully familiar. Not only was the sight of slaves common in these cities; their residents, who were taken captive, wrote letters to their relatives and petitions to municipal and royal authorities on a regular basis. Beyond the harsh labor, writing formed an important activity in the life of many captives (Garcés, 2005; Szpiech, 2017); moreover, a few former captives published books recounting their travels and travails. Scholars have paid a great deal of attention to these narratives, especially to a new kind of captivity narrative that emerged in Spain in the 1580s (Camamis, 1977). Its authors were former captives, who recounted their past experience and sprinkled the plot with references to historical events and people—captives, pirates, renegades, and others. The genre's reliance on reference to true events distinguished it from the Byzantine novel, which for centuries, described the adventures of fictionalized captivities across the Mediterranean. The Spanish texts best exemplifying this shift were Antonio de Sosa's famous *Topography and General History of Algiers* and Cervantes' Algerian plays (*The Bagnios of Algiers*, *The Great Sultana* [Cervantes, 2010], and *The Traffic of Algiers*), as well as the three chapters from *Don Quixote* forming the unit known as the “Captive's Tale” (Sosa, 2011 [1612]; Cervantes, 2003). To these we may add the autobiographies of Diego de Galán, Jerónimo de Pasamonte, and Jerónimo de Gracián and the studies of North Africa by former captives such Diego de Torres and Luis del Mármol Carvajal (Galán, 2001; Pasamonte, 2006; Gracián, 2006 [1609]; Torres, 1980 [1586]; Del Mármol Carvajal, 1953 [1573]). While Spaniards were the first to experiment with this new style of representing captivity, Portuguese, French, and above all English authors soon followed in their tracks.

Literary critics and historians of early modern Spain and Britain such as Linda Colley, Nabil Matar, and Miguel Martínez have read these narratives against the backdrop of empire and argued that they expressed imperial anxieties—acknowledgement of Islam's superior political and cultural power and a sense of geographic and demographic insignificance in the case of Britons; the experience of defeat by Muslim powers in military clashes along the North African shores in the case of Spanish soldiers (Colley, 2002; Martínez, 2016; Matar, 1999, 2005). To the contrary, María Antonia Garcés and Mar Martínez Góngora have stressed how captivity narratives supported colonial expansion and the struggle against Islam (Garcés, 2011; Martínez-Góngora, 2013). To some extent, these divergent interpretations are a product of the choice of sources. Works centering on their authors' capture, slavery, and redemption commonly expressed fears and awe in the face of Islam. Works focusing mostly on the history and ethnography of Maghribi polities had the potential to serve colonial agendas.

Reception history sheds further light on these interpretative differences. For example, Mármol Carvajal's *General Description of Africa*, Torres' *Relation of the Origin and Succession of the Sharifs and the State of the Kingdoms of Morocco: Fez and Taroudant*, and Sosa's *Topography and History of Algiers* were written in the third quarter of the sixteenth century, before Spain gave up on its North African colonial project, and their authors probably hoped to contribute to that project. However, Torres and Sosa's work were only published posthumously (1586, 1612) and Mármol faced difficulties republishing the first volume of his work together with the second (1573, 1599). Part of the problem was

that Spain turned its attention to Northern Europe and the Atlantic, and the idea of conquering the Maghrib suddenly sounded obsolete. Readers and publishers either did not identify with these authors' colonial agendas or did not detect them in these texts at all. Of these three works, Sosa's *Topography and History of Algiers* was the most successful, but mostly among Trinitarians and Mercedarians, who, rather than calling for conquest, sought to excite believers to collect alms for the ransom of captives (Silvestre, 1690). The fate of these texts—read against the grain of their authors' intentions—points at the importance of their reception and uses.

The rich texture and personal drama of captivity narratives has led scholars of the topic to read them as transparent representations of the experience of captivity. As depictions of captivity as a whole, however, they suffer at a minimum from a selection problem. With the exception of Sosa, only ransomed captives, exclusively Christians, composed such texts—and only a minority among ransomed captives put their experience in writing. Moreover, authors wrote down their experiences months, even years, after they returned home, at a moment when their agenda was often to convince readers that they had remained faithful to their creed. Scholarship has often failed to take these factors into account.

Recently, in two short, illuminating articles, James Amelang has suggested expanding the corpus of captivity narratives by including in it "ego documents"— different forms of texts written in the first person and reflecting on their author's experience (Amelang, 2009, 2014). Spain, Italy, France, and other polities had produced massive number of such texts. In the Spanish context, they can be grossly divided into two groups: service memoranda and *trazas* or transcriptions of depositions of prisoners at the Inquisition. Soldiers and civilians submitted service memoranda to the crown on their own or their kin's behalf, petitioning some form of recompense for past service or captivity (Tarruell, 2015b). These texts unfolded narratives of service, capture, enslavement, and violence and were often supported by captives' letters, their summaries, or witness depositions, which vouched for the claims petitioners made. Some were submitted after petitioners had been ransomed, but captives also frequently initiated such texts during their captivity. Even the illiterate sent letters and information, which they had written with the assistance of others, especially ecclesiastics (Hershenzon, 2018, forthcoming). *Trazas* often unfolded stories of renegades, Christians taken captive and converted to Islam voluntarily or by force (Amelang, 2009, 2014). The trial dossiers of which they formed part included testimonies of other former captives, renegades, and in some cases letters that captives had written to their relatives (Fiume, 2013). In that sense, and in contrast to the narratives by ex-captives, many of these bureaucratic autobiographies do not merely represent the experience of captivity but also constitute a material trace of that experience and point at the importance of writing for captives.

Recently, Gillian Weiss has argued that in France, ransom operated as a state-forming mechanism, a way of making new subjects, and a practice in relation to which ideas of Frenchness, were shaped. She has demonstrated this by charting the process in which ransom became royal prerogative, and how French kings claimed sovereignty by rescuing subjects from regions over which their control was still contested (Weiss, 2011). Wolfgang Kaiser and Lisa Voigt have made related arguments about links between, on the one hand, aspects of modernity, such as the emergence of the modern state and the Scientific Revolution and, on the other, the production of captivity ego-documents and ransom-related textual practices (Kaiser, 2008b; Voigt, 2009).

Focusing on the late 16th-century Italian Peninsula, Wolfgang Kaiser has analyzed records that urban confraternities issued and collected in the process of engineering the ransom of their members or their members' relatives held captive in the Maghrib. He has argued that the procedure of ransom and the textual practices it generated operated as a laboratory for the development and refinement of means of control and identification of people, soon to be associated with the modern state. Captives, renegades, their family members, ecclesiastics, and state officials experimented with different narrative forms, rhetorical devices, and literary tropes as they negotiated scripts to express the circumstances of their capture, need of ransom, or conversion. Composing the letters that initiated the ransom process, putting one's captivity story in writing, was a risky enterprise. Captives' freedom hinged upon their success in crafting documents that would convince family members to collect alms and officials to provide aid towards their ransom. Similarly, renegades, whom the Inquisition investigated, had to craft a story introducing the right mitigating circumstances of their conversion, in order to convince the inquisitors to punish them lightly

(Bennassar, 1989; Rodríguez Mediano, 2001). The practices of control, identification, and verifying one's past that we associate with the formation of the modern state, Kaiser has argued, developed in the 16th century Mediterranean as a response to the problem of captivity.

In a comparative study of Portuguese, Spanish, and English captivity narratives, Lisa Voigt has established a different link between captivity and aspects of modernity arguing that captivity was crucial in the production of knowledge, identity, and authority. The experience of captivity bestowed authority on captives and turned them into experts on the societies that captured them. State officials and publics across Europe sought the knowledge that captives produced (García-Arenal, 2014). In this sense, Voigt has claimed, captivity not only fomented religious opposition but also contributed to new forms of knowledge and authority. The importance of empirical experiential knowledge about the Muslim (and Amerindian) capturing societies, she has argued, predated, and prefigured the Scientific Revolution.

By writing, reporting, and petitioning, captives participated in other regional processes unrelated to modernity. Giovanna Fiume has shown that the canonization process of a Franciscan, who was martyred in Morocco in 1631, depended almost exclusively on reports of captives in Morocco (Fiume, 2009). By collecting testimonies and composing witness depositions, enslaved captives, sometimes thought of as "dead bodies," (Haedo, 1612) activated a legal persona in their home communities from their places of captivity. Captives' letters, reporting the death or conversion to Islam of others from their home community, put other legal processes in motion. Reports of death of their husbands in captivity transformed married women into widows, and this change of status allowed them to manage property or remarry. News about conversion could alienate converts from their family members, exclude them from their home community, and lead to their excommunication (Anaya Hernández, 2006; Vaquer Bennasar, 2014). Politicians and generals also depended upon captives' reports for fresh news about the enemy's whereabouts crucial for the protection of Spain's Mediterranean territories. While we have a growing body of scholarship on 16th-century espionage in the eastern Mediterranean and the role captives and renegades played in this activity, we know nearly nothing about spies and intelligence in the 17th century in the western half of the sea (Gürkan, 2012, 2015; Varriale, 2012).



Mining the precious information buried in the letters, reports, and complaints that captives sent home promises to shed much light on hitherto understudied links among Ottoman Algiers and Tunis, Morocco, Spain, France, and the Italian Peninsula. By positioning captives as gatekeepers of their home communities, captivity ego documents reshaped communal and institutional boundaries, stretching them across the sea. Captives did not mean to produce these effects. They used writing mostly to contact their kin or home authorities and arrange their redemption. The larger effects of these texts were the unintended consequences of captives' engagement with writing.

4 | REDEMPTION

Despite the small proportion of ransomed captives (not more than 10% or 15% [Stella, 2000; Davis, 2001]), much work has focused on the agents who liberated captives—friars and merchants—and the mechanisms developed for that purpose. In the western Mediterranean, members of the orders of the Holy Trinity and Our Lady of the Mercy, established at the turn of the 13th century to ransom Christian captives, redeemed the largest numbers of captives. Early studies of these orders, authored by their members, offer chronologies of the rescue missions, but are in fact no more than idealized and ideological representations that served as propaganda for the campaigns the orders had launched to boost their prestige and encourage believers to collect alms for the redemption of captives (Dan, 1649; De la Madre de Dios, 1652). While they portray the captivity of Christians in North Africa as a living hell, they ignore the similar numbers of Muslim slaves in Spain. The only study on Algerian captives in Europe, which seeks to amend the imbalance, offers a mirror image according to which the Muslims were only victims and the Christians the ultimate villains (Belhamissi, 1988).

A series of studies written in the last 10 years, building on Ellen Friedman's earlier 1983 study, has greatly advanced our understanding of the redemptive labor of the friars. This research relies on the neatly stacked—now

digitized—serial documentation the friars produced from the 1570s on, the result of a royal imposition of strict book keeping practices on the friars, in an attempt to transform the orders into an arm of the crown. Scholars have used these records to reconstruct and analyze the sources and mechanisms of fundraising, their institutionalization during the last quarter of the 16th century, and the ransom procedures that governed their expeditions, and to quantify the number, age, gender, time spent in captivity, and price paid for the rescued captives (Barrio Gozalo, 2006; Davis, 2003; Friedman, 1983; Martínez Torres, 2004; Weiss, 2011).

While we now understand much better how ecclesiastic redemption worked, the near exclusive reliance on these records has its costs. Trinitarian and Mercedarian sources create the appearance of a royal monopoly on ransoming and represent the rescue of captives as an exclusively religious endeavor, an attempt to save souls in danger of converting to Islam under the duress of captivity (Díaz Borrás, 2001). Indeed, as far as the friars were concerned, they were not economic actors, but good Christians motivated by a sense of social obligation to their fellow brethren. And yet, the friars paid cash and kind for the souls they redeemed, were never alone in the ransom market, and always competed, collaborated, and overlapped with Christian, Jewish, and Muslim merchants who also rescued captives (Epalza, 1969; Tarruell, 2015a).

Scholars working on captivity in the context of Italy, where the orders' presence was insignificant and urban fraternities usually organized ransom operations, have taken a different perspective. They have begun to examine captivity and ransom in terms of ransom networks and the intermediaries that formed them. In a series of articles and collected volumes, Wolfgang Kaiser redefined the redemption of captives as part of an "economy of ransom" created by piracy, *corso*, and the traffic of people (Calafat & Kaiser, 2014; Kaiser, 2006, 2008a, b). The actors, practices, and norms that formed this ransom economy, Kaiser has argued, regulated religious violence, and rationalized commerce with Muslims. In contrast to national perspectives, this approach avoids a reading of captivity or ransom in conflictual terms, and it brings into relief networks that otherwise went unnoticed. Moreover, Kaiser has shed much new light on issues such as transaction costs, commercial and linguistic intermediaries, and insurance. Several of the contributions to a volume on the economy of ransom edited by Kaiser have demonstrated the results of this approach in the Spanish context (Andújar Castillo, 2008; Pardo Molero, 2008; Planas, 2008). Their corrective emphasis on commercial intermediaries, at the expense of the well-studied orders of redemption, however, risks divorcing two kinds of actors who either worked together or competed with each other. Moreover, while the term "the economy of ransom" does not necessarily reduce the field to economics, some of the scholars focusing on that economy have not always been sensitive enough to the role of politics, religion, and society in the shaping of that economy (Chaney, Ambrus, & Salitskiy, 2010; Bunes Ibarra, 1989).

The choice of scholarly foci—either on redeeming friars or on ransoming merchants—reflects contrasting understandings of what piracy and ransom were. According to the scholars focusing on religious orders, Muslim corsairs engaged in a Jihad, and rescuing captives was a way of redeeming their souls. According to historians focusing on merchants, greed motivated corsairs, and ransom was no more than an opportunity for an economic gain. This scholarly gap divides the western Mediterranean in two. In the western part, allegedly ecclesiastic institutions alone rescued captives, while in the middle part of the Middle Sea (between Italy and Tunis) merchants were in charge of the task. The scholarly division also partly maps onto the "northern invasion" thesis, the dominant historiographical narrative of the early modern Mediterranean. According to this argument, at the turn of the 17th century, the English, French, and Dutch invaded the Mediterranean, transforming it from a region governed by religious enmity and archaic violence to an economic sphere in which homogenous nation-states competed with one another (Braudel, 1972). This is a narrative of modernization, with its familiar northern European agents, projected onto the early modern period (Fusaro, 2010; Greene, 2002).

The increasing presence of Northern Europeans in the period is undeniable, and English, Dutch, and German sailors also fell prey to piracy. Northern Europeans (from England, the United Provinces, and the main cities of the Hanseatic League—Lubeck and Hamburg) and south Europeans responded differently to the challenge of captivity (Ressel & Zwierlein, 2013). In contrast to Italian and Spanish ransom institutions characterized by "a post damage charity mode," northern powers developed mechanisms of captivity insurance or premium payments paid in advance

(before captivity). Many of these states, for example, relied heavily on the Republic of Venice to rescue their subjects enslaved in the Maghrib (Ressel, 2010). At the same time, northern European solutions differed in their efficiency and the degree to which the state controlled the process in ways that were linked to the territory dominant confession (Ressel, 2010).

The problem with the "Northern invasion" narrative is that treating religion and economics as mutually exclusive frameworks fails to fully explain how Mediterranean captivity and ransom worked. One way of avoiding this artificial bifurcation is to treat ransom as a transnational political economy, which the church, Mediterranean rulers, and captives and corsairs competed to shape (Frank, 2012; Hershenzon, 2016). For example, in 1608, a Genoese fleet captured 13-year-old Fatima, the daughter of an Algerian Janissary, and sold her to slavery in Livorno. Fatima contacted her father who commissioned a Corsican merchant to ransom her. When the Genoese sold Fatima, they transformed her into a market commodity. But not everybody playing in the ransom market was motivated by profit. Fatima's father was simply trying to reunite with his child. Similarly, we have seen how Trinitarians and Mercedarians did not perceive themselves to be motivated by a calculating spirit, but rather by a sense of obligation towards members of their confession.

Moreover, the political economy of ransom not only commodified humans but also re-humanized commodities, in that religious mechanisms removed commodities from the market. Fatima was almost saved, but the ship that should have returned her to Algiers stopped in Corsica (then under Genoese dominion), where she was forced to convert to Catholicism. Her conversion transformed her from a commodity into a community member not to be exchanged. Usually, conversion made converts undesirable to members of their home community, who immediately gave up on their efforts to rescue the converted captives. This was not true in Fatima's case. Algiers' Janissaries supported her father's continued efforts, detaining a Trinitarian redemption expedition, present at the time in Algiers, and freezing the commerce in captives until Fatima was returned. The Algerian pasha, who was interested in the profits he made in the ransom market, opposed the Janissaries' move. The pasha had the same interest as the Spanish king—both sought to return to business as usual—and was positioned against the Janissaries, converts to Islam from a different community, who stopped the market seeking to protect a group member. The world of ransom was not arranged strictly along national lines or along confessional ones. As these entangled lives demonstrate, the political economy of ransom was the result of the interaction between market forces, political conflicts, social logics, and religious mechanisms (Hershenzon, 2016). Ransom, a unique form of trade, was one of the main motors generating links between Islam and Christendom across the sea.

5 | CONCLUSION

Muslim and Christian captivity and enslavement were interrelated and interdependent elements of a single Mediterranean system of bondage, but they were not identical. In fact, the system was asymmetrical (Kaiser, 2008a, b). In the absence of institutions such as the Catholic orders of redemption or Italian confraternities, Muslims faced greater difficulties when seeking to arrange their ransom. Asymmetry was also manifest in the production and archiving of sources that recorded ransom operations and the negotiations that led to them. Whereas the orders of redemption and Italian city-states produced and preserved such records systematically, similar documents for the 17th-century Maghrib, with the exception of Algiers (Loualich, 2008, 2010), were either produced in smaller quantities, never archived, do not survive, or still await discovery and study (García-Arenal, 2009; Henia, 2003; Maziane, 2007; Schroeter, 2002).

In this regard, beyond the important questions of terminology, methodology, and theory, the greatest challenge and promise for this emerging field is empirical. European archives contain documents composed by Muslims (and Jews) from the Maghrib (For example, Bossy, 1973; Castries, 1905-1960; Gallotta, 1979; García-Arenal, Rodríguez Mediano, & El Hour, 2002); however, these records, by their nature, provide only a glimpse into the world of North African actors. Moroccan and Ottoman sources from North Africa could shed new light on the interests of local

and imperial Muslim actors, intra- and trans-imperial relations related to ransom—for example, between Tunis and Algiers or between Algiers and Morocco—Muslims within and across polities. Creating archives of documents from the Muslim Mediterranean would make it possible to create a more balanced and complete history of captivity and ransom and by extension of the early modern Mediterranean in general.

ENDNOTES

[1] At least two recent review articles also cover this rapidly growing field (Bosco, 2013; Oualdi, 2008).

[2] His book title sensationally and erroneously refers to them as "white" slaves (Davis, 2003).

REFERENCES

Anaya Hernández, L. A. (2006). *Moros en la costa: dos siglos de corsarismo berberisco en las islas canarias (1569–1749)*. Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Gobierno de Canarias, Consejería de Educación, Cultura y Deportes, Dirección General de Universidades e Investigación : Fundación de Enseñanza Superior a Distancia de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria : Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Centro Asociado de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria.

Amelang, J. (2009). L'autobiografia popolare nella Spagna moderna: Osservazioni generali e particolari. In G. Ciappelli (Ed.), *Memoria*, *famiglia*, *identità tra Italia ed Europa nell'età moderna* (pp. 113–130). Bologna: Il mulino.

Amelang, J. (2014). Writing chains: Slave autobiography from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic. In S. Hanß, & J. Schiel (Eds.), *Mediterranean slavery revisited*, *500–1800/Neue Perspektiven auf mediterraner Sklaverei*, *500–1800* (pp. 541–556). Zurich: Chronos Verlag.

Andújar Castillo, F. (2008). Los rescates de cautivos en las dos orillas del Mediterráneo y en el mar (alafías) en el siglo XVI. In W. Kaiser (Ed.), *Le commerce des captifs: les intermédiaires dans l'échange et le rachat des prisonniers en Méditerraneé*, *XVe-XVIIIe siècle* (pp. 135–164). Rome: École française de Rome.

Barrio Gozalo, M. (2006). *Esclavos y cautivos. Conflicto entre la cristianidad y el Islam en el siglo XVIII*. Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León.

Belhamissi, M. (1988). *Les captifs algériens et l'Europe chrétienne* (*1518–1830*). Alger: Entreprise nationale du livre.

Bennassar, B., & Bennassar, L. (1989). *Los cristianos de Alá*, *La fascinante aventura de los renegados*. Madrid: Nerea.

Bono, S. (2002). La schiavitù nel Mediterraneo moderno. Storia di una storia. *Cahiers de la Mediterranée*, *LXV*, 1–16.

Bono, S. (2010). Slave histories and memoires in the Mediterranean world: A study of the sources (sixteenth–eighteenth centuries). In M. Fusaro, C. Heywood, & M.-S. Omri (Eds.), *Trade and cultural exchange in the early modern Mediterranean*, *Braudel's maritime legacy* (pp. 97–115). London, New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers.

Borucki, A., Eltis, D., & Wheat, D. (2015). Atlantic history and the slave trade to Spanish America. *American Historical Review*, *120*, 433–461.

Bosco, M. (2013). Il commercio dei captivi nel Mediterraneo di età moderna (secc. XVI - XVIII). Orientamenti e prospettive attuali di ricerca. *Cromohs*, *18*, 57–82.

Bossy, M. (1973). Lettres adressées d'Alger au Grand-Duche deToscane. *Revue d'histoire et de civilisation du Maghreb*, *10*, 57–80.

Braudel, F. (1972). *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Philip II*. New York: Harper & Row.

Bunes Ibarra, M. Á. (1989). *La imagen de los musulmanes y del norte de África en la España de los siglos XVI y XVII: los caracteres de una hostilidad*. Madrid: CSIC.

Calafat, G., & Kaiser, W. (2014). The economy of ransoming in the early modern Mediterranean: A form of cross-cultural trade between Southern Europe and the Maghreb (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries). In F. Trivellato, L. Halevi, & C. Antunes (Eds.), *Religion and trade: Cross-cultural exchanges in world history*, *1000–1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Camamis, G. (1977). *Estudios sobre el cautiverio en el Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

Casares, A. M. (2000). *La esclavitud en la Granada del siglo XVI*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Castries, H., Cossé Brissac, P., & Cenival, P. (Eds) (1905-1960). *Les sources inédites de l'histoire du Maroc de 1530 á 1845* (Vol. 30)*3 ser*. Paris: Paul Geunther.

Cervantes, M. de (2003). *Don Quixote*, translated by Edith Grossman, New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Cervantes, M. de (2010). '*The Bagnios of Algiers' and 'The Great Sultana': Two Plays of Captivity*, Translated and edited by Barbara Fuchs and Aaron J. Ilika, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Chaney E., Ambrus A., & Salitskiy I. (2010). Pirates of the Mediterranean: An empirical investigation of bargaining with transaction costs. Economic Research Initiatives at Duke (ERID). Working Paper No. 115, http://scholar.harvard.edu/chaney/publications/pirates-mediterranean-empirical-investigation-bargaining-transaction-costs-0 accessed on January 19th 2016.

Colley, L. (2002). *Captives, Britain, empire and the world, 1600–1850*. New York: Anchor Books.

Dan, P. (1649). *Histoire de Barbarie, et de ses Corsaires. Des royavmes, et des villes d'Alger, de Tvnis, de Salé, [et] de Tripoly. Divisée en six livres. Ov il est traitté de levr govvernement, de leurs moeurs, de leurs cruautez, de leurs brigandages, de leurs sortileges, [et] de plusieurs autres particularitez remarquables. Ensemble des grandes miseres et des crvels tourmens qu'endurent les Chrestiens captifs parmy ces infidels*. Paris: Pierre Recolet.

Davis, R. (2001). Counting European slaves on the Barbary coast. *Past and Present*, *172*, 87–124.

Davis, R. (2003). *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters: White slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary coast, and Italy, 1500–1800*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

De la Madre de Dios, D. (1652). *Chronica de los descalços de la Santissima Trinidad redentores de cautious*. Madrid: Juan Martín de Barrio.

Del Mármol Carvajal, L. (1953). *Descripción general de África*. Tomo I. Madrid: CSIC.

Díaz Borrás, A. (2001). *El miedo al Mediterráneo: La caridad popular valenciana y la redención de cautivos bajo poder musulmán 1323–1539*. Barcelona: CSIC.

Epalza, M. de (1969). Moriscos y Andalusíes en Túnez durante el siglo XVII. *Al-Andalus*, *34*(2), 247–327.

Fiume, G. (2009). *Schiavitù mediterranee. Corsari, rinnegati e santi di età moderna*. Milano: Bruno Mondarini.

Fiume, G. (2013). Lettres de Barbarie: esclavage et rachat de captifs siciliens (XVIe-XVIIIe siècle). *Cahiers de la Méditerranée*, *87*, 229–254.

Fiume, G. (2015). Redimir y rescatar en el Mediterráneo moderno. *Darssana*, *23*, 54–77.

Fontenay, M. (1996). L'esclave galérien dans la Méditerranée des temps modernes. In H. Bresc (Ed.), *Figures de l'esclave au Moyen-Age et dans le monde moderne* (pp. 115–143). Paris: L'Harmattan.

Fontenay, M. (2001). Il mercato maltese degli schiavi al tempo dei Cavalieri di San Giovanni (1530-1798). *Quaderni Storici*, *107*, 391–413.

Fontenay, M. (2008). Esclaves et/ou captifs: préciser les concepts. In W. Kaiser (Ed.), *Le commerce des captifs: les intermédiaires dans l'échange et le rachat des prisonniers en Méditerranée, XVe-XVIIIe siècle* (pp. 15–24). Rome: École française de Rome.

Frank, A. (2012). The Children of the desert and the laws of the sea: Austria, Great Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and the Mediterranean slave trade in the nineteenth century. *American Historical Review*, *117*, 410–444.

Friedman, E. G. (1983). *Spanish captives in North Africa in the early modern age*. Madison, Wis: University of Wisconsin Press.

Fusaro, M. (2010). After Braudel: A reassessment of Mediterranean history between the Northern Invasion and the Caravane Maritime. In M. Fusaro, C. Heywood, & M.-S. Omri (Eds.), *Trade and cultural exchange in the early modern Mediterranean: Braudel's maritime legacy* (pp. 1–22) London and New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers.

Galán, D. (2001). In M. Á. de Bunes, & M. Barchino (Eds.), *Relación del Cautiverio y Libertad de Diego Galán, Natural de la Villa de Consuegra y Vecino de la Ciudad de Toledo*. Toledo: Diputación Provincial de Toledo.

Gallotta, A. (1979). Diplomi turchi dell'archivio di stato di Firenze. In *Studi magrebini* (Vol. XI) (pp. 167–205) + Facsimiles I-XII.

Garcés, M. A. (2005). *Cervantes en Argel. Historia de un cautivo*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

Garcés, M. A. (2011). "Introduction". In M. A. Garcés (Ed.), *An Early Modern Dialogue with Islam: Antonio de Sosa's Topography of Algiers (1612)* (pp. 1–78). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

García-Arenal, M. (2009). *Ahmad al-Mansur, the beginning of modern Morocco*. Oxford: One World.

García-Arenal, M. (2014). The Moriscos in Morocco: From Granadan emigration to the Hornacheros of Salé. In M. García-Arenal, & G. Wiegers (Eds.), *The expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain: A Mediterranean diaspora* (pp. 286–328). Leiden/Boston: Brill.

García-Arenal, M., Rodríguez Mediano, F., & El Hour, R. (Eds) (2002). *Cartas marruecas: documentos de Marruecos en archivos españoles (siglos XVI-XVII), Estudios árabes e islámicos; Monografías* (Vol. 3). Madrid: CSIC.

Gracián, J. (2006). In M. Ángel, & Beatriz (Eds.), *Tratado de la redención de cautivos*. Sevilla: Espuela de Plata.

Greene, M. (2002). Beyond the northern invasion: The Mediterranean in the 17th century. *Past and Present*, *174*, 42–71.

Gürkan, E. S. (2012). The efficacy of Ottoman counter-intelligence in the 16th century. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.*, *65*, 1–38.

Gürkan, E. S. (2015). Fooling the Sultan: Information, decision-making and the 'Mediterranean Faction' (1585-1587). *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, *XLV*, 57–96.

Haedo, D. de (1612). *Topografía e historia general de Argel*. Valladolid: Diego Fernandez de Cordoba y Oviedo.

Henia, A. (2003). Archives ottomans en Tunisie et histoire régionale. In idem, A. el Moudden, & A. Benhadda (Eds.), *Les Ottomans au Maghreb à travers les archives locales et méditerranéennes* (pp. 241–255). Rabat: Université Mohammed V de Rabat.

Hershenzon, D. (2018). *Captivity, Commerce, and Communication: Early Modern Spain and the Mediterranean*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press forthcoming.

Hershenzon, D. (2013). Plaintes et menaces réciproques: captivité et violence religieuses dans la Méditerranée du XVIIe siècle. In J. Dakhlia, & W. Kaiser (Eds.), *Les Musulmans dans l'histoire de l'Europe. Tome 2. Passages et contacts en Méditerranée* (pp. 441–460). Paris: Albin Michel.

Hershenzon, D. (2014). '[P]ara que me saque cabesa por cabesa…': Exchanging Muslim and Christian slaves across the Mediterranean. *African Economic History*, *42*, 11–36.

Hershenzon, D. (2016). The political economy of ransom in the early modern Mediterranean. *Past and Present*, *231*, 61–95.

Kaiser, W. (2006). L'Économie de la rançon en Méditerranée occidentale (XVIe–XVIIe siècle). In S. Cavaciocchi (Ed.), *Ricchezza del mare: ricchezza dal mare, secc. XIII–XVIII*. Florence: Le Monnier.

Kaiser, W. (Ed) (2008a). *Le commerce des captifs: les intermédiaires dans l'échange et le rachat des prisonniers en Méditerranée, Xve-XVIIIe siècle*. Rome: École française de Rome.

Kaiser, W. (2008b). Les mots du rachat. Fiction et rhétorique dans les procédures de rachat de captifs en Méditerranéen, XVIe-XVIIe siècles. In F. Moureau (Ed.), *Captifs en Méditerranée (XVIe-XVIIIe siècles): Histoires, récits, et légendes* (pp. 103–117). Paris: PUPS.

Kaiser, W. (2008c). La excepción permanente. Actores, visibilidad y asimetrías en los intercambios comerciales entre los países europeos y el Magreb (siglos XVI-XVII). In J. A. Martínez Torres (Ed.), *Circulación de personas e intercambios en el Mediterráneo y en el Atlántico (siglos XVI, XVII, XVIII)* (pp. 171–189). Madrid: CSIC.

Kopytoff, I. (1986). The cultural biography of things: Commoditization as process. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective* (pp. 64–94). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Larquié, C. (1996). Captifs chrétiens et esclaves maghrébins au XVIIIe aux *siècle*: Une tentative de comparasion. In M. Luisa, S. Leon, & L. N. Gonçal (Eds.), *Captius i esclaus a l'Antiguitat i al Mon Modern* (pp. 347–364). Napoli: Jovene Editore.

Loualich, F. (2008). Emancipated female slaves in Algiers. Marriage, property, and social advancement in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In S. Cronin (Ed.), *Subalternities and social justice: History from below in the middle east and north Africa*. New York: Routledge.

Loualich, F. (2010). In the regency of Algiers: The human side of the Algerine Corso. In M. Fusaro, C. Heywood, & M.-S. Omro (Eds.), *Trade and cultural exchange in the early modern Mediterranean, Braudel's maritime legacy* (pp. 69–96). London, New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers.

Lovejoy, P. (1982). The volume of the Atlantic slave trade: A synthesis. *Journal of African History*, *23*, 494–500.

Martínez, M. (2016). *Front lines: Soldiers' writing in the early modern Hispanic world*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Martínez-Góngora, M. (2013). *Los espacios coloniales en las crónicas de Berbería*. Madrid: Iberoamericana; Frankfurt: Vervuert.

Martínez Torres, J. A. (2004). *Prisioneros de los infieles: vida y rescate de los cautivos cristianos en el Mediterráneo musulmán (siglos XVI-XVII)*. Barcelona: Edicions Bellaterra.

Matar, N. I. (1999). *Turks, Moors and Englishment in the age of discovery*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Matar, N. I. (2005). *Britain and Barbary, 1589–1689*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Mathiex, J. (1954). Trafic et prix de l'homme en Méditerranée aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, *9* (2), 157–164.

Maziane, L. (2007). *Salé et ses corsairs (1666–1727). Un port de course marocain au XVIIe siècle*. Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen.

Oualdi, M. (2008). D'Europe et d'Orient, les approches de l'esclavage des chrétiens en terres d'Islam. *Annales. Histoires et sciences sociales*, *4*, 829–843.

Pardo Molero, J. F. (2008). Mercaderes, frailes, corsarios y cautivos: intercambios entre el reino de Valencia y el norte de África en la primera mitad del siglo XVI. In W. Kaiser (Ed.), *Le commerce des captifs: les intermédiaires dans l'échange et le rachat des prisonniers en Méditerraneé, XVe-XVIIIe siècle* (pp. 165–192). Rome: École française de Rome.

Pasamonte, J. de (2006). In M. Á. de Bunes Ibarra (Ed.), *Autobiografía*. Seville: Ediciones Espuela de Plata.

Phillips, W. D., Jr. (2014). *Slavery in Medieval and early modern Iberia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Pike, R. (1983). *Penal servitude in early modern Spain*. Madison, Wis: University of Wisconsin Press.

Planas, N. (2008). Acteurs et mécanismes du rachat d'esclaves dans l'archipel Baléare au XVIIe siècle. In W. Kaiser (Ed.), *Le commerce des captifs: les intermédiaires dans l'échange et le rachat des prisonniers en Méditerraneé, XVe-XVIIIe siècle* (pp. 65–81). Rome: École française de Rome.

Ressel, M. (2010). The North European way of ransoming: Explorations into an unknown dimension of the early modern welfare state. *Historical Social Research*, *35*, 125–147.

Ressel, M., & Zwierlein, C. (2013). The ransoming of North European captives from Northern Africa. A comparison of Dutch, Hanseatic and English institutionalization of redemption from 1610–1645. In N. Jaspert, & S. Kolditz (Eds.), *Seeraub im Mittelmeerraum. Piraterie, Korsarentum und maritime Gewalt von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit* (pp. 377–406). Paderborn: Ferdinand *Schöningh*.

Rodríguez Mediano, F. (2001). Les conversions de Sebastião Pes de Vega, un Portugais au Maroc sa'dien. In M. García-Arenal (Ed.), *Conversions islamiques. Identités religieuses en Islam méditerranéen. Islamic Conversions. Religious Identities in Mediterranean Islam* (pp. 173–192). Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.

Sarti, R. (2001). Bolognesi schiavi dei 'turchi' e schiavi 'turchi' a Bologna tra cinque e settecento: alterità etnico-religiosa e riduzione in schiavitù. *Quaderni Storici*, *107*, 437–474.

Schroeter, D. J. (2002). *The Sultan's Jews, Morocco and the Sephardi world*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Silvestre, F. A. (1690). *Fundación histórica de los hospitales que la religión de la santissima Trinidad redempción de cautivos, de calçados, tiene en la ciudad de Argel*. Madrid: Julian de Paredes.

Sosa, A. de (2011). In M. A. Garcés (Ed.), *Topography and History of Algiers in An Early Modern Dialogue with Islam: Antonio de Sosa's Topography of Algiers (1612)*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Stella, A. (2000). *Histoires d'esclaves dans la Péninsule Ibérique*. Paris: éditions de l'école des hautes études en sciences sociales.

Stella, A. (2006). Les galères dans la Méditerranée (XVe-XVIIIe siècles). Miroir des mises en servitude. In M. Cottias, A. Stella, & B. Vincent (Eds.), *Esclavage et dépendances servils: histoire comparée* (pp. 265–282). Paris: L' Harmattan.

Subrahmanyam, S. (1997). Connected histories: Notes towards a reconfiguration of early modern Eurasia. *Modern Asian Studies*, *31*, 735–762.

Szpiech, R. (2017). Prisons and polemics: Captivity, confinement, and Medieval inter-religious encounter. In M. Garcéa Arenal (Ed.), *Polemical encounters: polemics between Christians Jews and Muslim in Iberia and beyond*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press Forthcoming.

Tarruell, C. (2015a). *Circulations entre Chrétienté et Islam: Captivité et esclavage des serviteurs de la Monarchie hispanique (ca. 1574–1609)* (Unpublished Dissertation Thesis). Paris: EHESS-UAM.

Tarruell, C. (2015b). Circulations entre Chrétienté et Islam. Quelques réflexions à propos des 'méritos y servicios' au service de la Monarchie hispanique (XVIe-XVIIe siècles). *Diasporas*, *25*, 45–57.

Torres, D. de (1980). In M. G. Arenal (Ed.), *Relación del origen de los xarifes y del estado de los reinos de Marruecos, Fez, y Tarudante*. Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.

Valensi, L. (1967). Esclaves chrétiens et esclaves noirs à Tunis au XVIIIe siècle. *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, *22*, 1267–1288.

Vaquer Bennasar, O. (2014). *Captius I renegats al segle XVII. Mallorquins captius entre musulmans. Renegats davant la inquisició de Mallorca*. Mallorca: El tall del temps maior.

Varriale, G. (2012). La capital de la frontera Mediterránea. Exiliados, espías y convertidos en la Nápoles de los virreyes. *Estudis*, *38*, 303–321.

Vincent, B. (2008). La esclavitud en el Mediterráneo occidental. In J. A. Martínez Torres (Ed.), *Circulación de personas e intercambios comerciales en el Mediterráneo y en el Atlántico (siglos XVI, XVII, XVIII)* (pp. 39–64). Madrid: CSIC.

Voigt, L. (2009). *Writing captivity in the early modern Atlantic: Circulations of knowledge and authority in the Iberian and English imperial worlds*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Weiss, G. L. (2011). *Captives and corsairs, France and slavery in the early modern Mediterranean*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Weiss, G. L. (2014). Ransoming 'Turks' from France's royal galleys. *African Economic History*, *42*, 37–58.

Zysberg, A. (1987). *Les Galériens du roi - vies et destins de 60 000 forçats sur les galères de France: 1680–1748*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Daniel Hershenzon is an assistant professor in the Department of Literatures, Cultures, and Languages at the University of Connecticut. He is currently completing a book manuscript titled "Captivity, Commerce, and Communication: Early Modern Spain and the Mediterranean." Hershenzon has published articles in the *Past and Present*, *Journal of Early Modern History*, *African Economic History*, *Philological Encounters*, and in edited volumes. Hershenzon focuses on the history of early modern Spain and the Mediterranean, the relations between the Spanish Monarchy and North Africa, slavery and captivity, Jewish, Muslim and Christian cultural intermediaries, conversion, writing and its uses, and Mediterranean material culture. He held fellowships from the SSRC, the

Mellon Foundation, the Humanities Institutes at the University of Michigan and at the University Connecticut, and the European University Institute in Florence.

How to cite this article: Hershenzon D. “Towards a connected history of bondage in the Mediterranean: Recent trends in the field”. *History Compass*. 2017;15:e12391. https://doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12391